DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 283 CG 016 862

AUTHOR Giles, Francine
TITLE The Effects of Doctoral Study on Marriage and Family: An Ethnographic Study.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American College Personnel Association (Houston, TX, March 13-16, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Doctoral Programs; *Family Life; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; Marital Instability; *Married Students; *Role Conflict; Spouses; *Stress Variables; Student College Relationship; Student Role; Student Welfare

ABSTRACT

Stresses which accompany graduate education are often a source of marital conflict and disruption for students and their families. To investigate the effects of the graduate experience on intra- and inter-family relationships among married doctoral student couples, and to discover how these students cope with the dual student/spouse role, 16 full-time married doctoral students (8 males and 8 females) and their non-enrolled but employed spouses participated in ethnographic interviews over a 6 month period. Results of ethnographic analyses highlighted four recurring themes: (1) support from spouse and parents (financial, emotional/psychological, academic, and basic needs); (2) factors affecting marital stability (i.e., financial problems, time pressures, children, communication, sexual concerns, role conflict, physical and emotional separation); (3) social relationships and interaction (influenced by such factors as interest in status changes, absence of married peers, fears associated with terminating relationships upon graduation, and special needs of the non-student); and (4) status (affected by such factors as living arrangements, student-spouse role conflicts, measurement of status through enrollment and grades, locus of control, and financial conditions). The results have implications for the role of university and student affairs professionals who deal with the married graduate student. The telephone interview and interview questions are appended. (Author/WAS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233283

The Effects of Doctoral Study on Marriage and Family: An Ethnographic Study

by

Francine Giles
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs/
Director of Minority Activities
The University of Tennessee at Martin
Martin, Tennessee 38238

A Paper Presented at the
Annual Meeting of
The American College Personnel Association

Houston, Texas

March 14--16, 1983

CG 016862

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Francine Giles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

Ethnographic interviews were conducted with sixteen full-time married doctoral students (eight males, eight females) ages 35 and under and their non-enrolled but employed spouses over a six-month period. Concepts of ethnographic analysis were employed to discover meanings and relationships and to aid in formulating hypotheses about married student life. Four major recurrring themes were discovered: (1) support from spouse and parents (financial, emotional/psychological, academic, and basic needs); (2) factors affecting marital stability, including differences in spouses' educational levels and interests, financial problems, time pressures, children, communication, sexual concerns, decision-making, role conflict, and physical and emotional separation; (3) social relationships and interaction, which are influenced by changes in student's interests and status, integration into university and residential communities, absence of peer group comprised of married students, support role of family, special needs of non-student (e.g., not growing intellectually with spouse), changing expectations of friendships as student matures, fears associated with terminating relationships upon graduation, use of professionals in resolving personal problems, financial problems, and children; and (4) status, which may be affected by couple's living arrangements; student-spouse role conflicts; tendency to use enrollment and good grades to measure status; perception of study in enhancing professional skills and status; locus of

control, as enrollment may foster dependency; financial conditions; potential loss of student's importance as family member due to increased absence from home and change in family sex roles; and role of graduate/teaching associate.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Sample Selection	3
Importance of Further Study	5
Summary of Results	7
A. Support Systems	7
B. Marital Stability	16
C. Social Relationships and Interaction	32
D. Status	41
Conclusions	49
Implications	53
Bibliography	54
Appendices	
Appendix A: Telephone Questionnaire	59
Appendix B: Interview Guide I	61
Interview Guide II	62

Introduction

The interest in this project arose out of what had initially been concern for how students whose marriages are disrupted while in school cope with their new roles as single persons and perhaps as single parents. Finally, it was decided that rather than look at the termination of marriage itself, emphasis should focus instead on how the married student couple copes with the educational experience, how enrollment affects marital/family stability, whether enrollment creates role conflicts, and how such conflicts are resolved. Those interests formed the basis for the present study. The researcher felt that a study about how the married student resolves the dual demands created by the student-marriage combination may have broader higher education and student personnel implications and applicability than a study of the already disrupted marriage that results from combining school and marriage.

The data obtained have theoretical meaning, but enough is not known about the married doctoral student's interpersonal relationships to be able to determine relevant problems and hypotheses or to test them. Such hypotheses have been discovered through these research data. However, this study does not purport to test these hypotheses; that is a matter for further study. Instead, it generates hypotheses and makes assumptions about married student life.

The major purpose of this study was to conduct an in-depth investigation into the effects of the graduate experience on the intra- and inter-family relationships among married doctoral student couples and to discover how these students cope with the dual student-spouse role and make meaning of their experiences, as well as assess how these students describe the quality of their lives.

The problems investigated lends itself to the utilization of the natural-

istic approach for investigating social interactions. A qualitative methodological approach applicable to determining how people engage in social activities involves four aspects (Lofland, 1976): (1) intimate familiarity, (2) focusing and describing the prime situation confronted by the individuals, (3) understanding interactional strategies and tactics used in confronting such situations, and (4) developing and melding qualitative episodes into disciplined abstractions. Two other aspects include treatment of the data collected primarily as they relate to the data's practical utility and theoretical consideration in relation to other studies.

This study employed techniques of ethnographic interviews in collecting and analyzing data. It represents a "search for the parts of a culture, the relationships among the parts, and their relationships to the whole" (Spradley, 1979, p. 142). This method enabled the researcher to discover questions to be asked in each interview, and each succeeding interview differed from those which preceded it, since the researcher was guided by newly discovered meanings that emerged from each interview.

Ethnographic interviewing is best thought of "as a series of friendly conversations into which the researcher slowly introduces new elements to assist informants to respond as informants" (Spradley, 1979, p. 58). Further, the three most important elements of ethnographic interviewing are its explicit purpose, repeated explanations to the informants, and ethnographic questions, which ask the informant for fuller explanations and descriptions, allow for discovery about the basic parts of the informant's cultural knowledge, and help determine what an informant means by native terms (Spradley, 1979).

Ethnographic research follows a particular sequence which differs from that employed in most social science research (Spradley, 1979). It includes

the following processes: (1) selecting a problem, (2) collecting cultural data, (3) analyzing cultural data, (4) formulating ethnographic hypotheses, and (5) writing the ethnography. Although the five steps appear as a strictly linear step-by-step procedure, many of the steps are often repeated before the collected ethnography data are written in final form. The discovery of relationships in the data collected enables the ethnographer to formulate certain hypotheses or propositions which are tested by going back and collecting more cultural data, analyzing them, formulating new hypotheses, and repeating these stages if necessary. Even as the ethnographic report is written, new hypothese may surface, thus causing the ethnographer to engage in still more field work.

Four strategies comprise ethnographic analysis (Spradley, 1979, p. 94): (1) domain analysis, (2) taxonomic analysis, (3) componential analysis, and (4) theme analysis.

Ethnography seeks to systematically understand human culture from the point of view of those who have learned their culture. The researcher learns from the informants rather than merely study them. Ethnography leads to an understanding of another way of life from the perspective of the individual whose way of life is being investigated (Spradley, 1979).

Sample Selection: The participants in this study are American-born, full-time married doctoral students ages thirty-five and under who were enrolled in the Graduate School at The Ohio State University during Winter and Spring quarters, 1982, and their non-enrolled spouses. All students were married at the time of enrollment and reside in the home with their spouses. (Commuting students who spend at least two days per week or weekends with spouses were included.)

They were selected from among the married doctoral students who obtained their Spring quarter registration forms in person from the Graduate School during the two-week registration period in February, 1982. A telephone survey (Appendix A) was used to determine each student's eligibility for participating in the study. A call was made to all students who had given written consent during registration to be contacted by phone for a fuller explanation of the study and of their prospective participation.

The names of students who remained eligible for participation were arranged alphabetically into one of the four major strata according to demographic data they had provided: male and female students whose spouses are not enrolled but are employed and who have children; (2) male and female students whose spouses are not enrolled but are employed and who do not have children. Using a table of random numbers, four couples were assigned to each of the four categories, resulting in sixteen couples participating in the study.

Separate and joint interviews were held with the couples. A total of from six to eight hours were spent with each couple over a six-month period from February through August, 1982. All interviews were taped, and analyses were made from tape transcriptions.

The use of structured interviews was felt to be inappropriate for an ethnographic study, and, therefore, a broad range of issues and questions was devised to help guide the interviews. These questions (Appendix B) were developed from information taken from a review of relevant literature on student marriages, and questions were developed and revised as the interviews progressed.

Importance of Further Study on Married Doctoral Students:

1. Married students represent approximately 25% of the college student population.

2. Married students have traditionally been ignored and not offered services that contribute to their holistic development. Further, their spouses and children have received little if any attention from the university.

3. There is a need for developing a set of criteria to be used as indicators of marital stability and happiness in student marriages, as traditional criteria used to measure happiness in conventional marriages appear to be inappropriate for assessing student marriages.

4. The postgraduate effects of doctoral study, which is a critical point in the individual's development, should be studied. The adjustment period immediately following graduation may lead to dissatisfaction with the division of labor adopted as a student couple and with the non-student spouse's new role. The strong support role played by the non-student wife, if no longer necessary, may displace her. A study is needed to determine how the new roles differ and why they change, and the long-term effects of doctoral study on marriage and family.

5. How does the student couple reenter the larger American culture upon completion of the doctorate? What "rites of passage" exist, and what are their components? How is the transition made from "marginality" to integration into the larger community?

6. The doctoral student couple lacks valid norms to help the couple beginning doctoral study develop appropriate expectations about this new lifestyle and judge the appropriateness of their actions and decisions. These students express that they are often uncertain about the appropriateness of what they are doing, yet they lack norms to aid them in shaping their behaviors.

7. As more and more studies are conducted, it may become possible to develop taxonomies about married student life and make some general predictions about their lifestyles and behaviors. These may prove to be effective in orientation and counseling services to the new student couple.

8. Are there differences in the couples' experiences according to major fields of study? Do fields which emphasize interpersonal relationships and offer opportunities for peer interaction account for different kinds of experiences and attitudes among their students than among students in other fields?

9. Greater definition of the institution's role with regard to married students is needed. It may prefer to refrain from becoming involved in married students' lives, or perhaps it is unclear about what its role should be. The student tends to prefer minimal involvement from the institution, yet the need for some intervention has been demonstrated. This may be met through the provision of campus psychologists or personnel with a medical background, since couples seem to prefer these. Further, personnel should have knowledge, understanding, and appreciation for non-traditional marriage forms, as techniques used for conventional marriages may not apply.

10. Various support services are needed to aid the student couple in meeting its new demands, including child care, marriage counseling, more flexible class schedules, and more relevant campus activities which appeal to married students.

11. As more and more older students enroll, there is likely to be a concomitant increase in the number of married students. Their return could drastically alter family functioning.

12. The lack of attention institutions give to the large number of married students suggests that a tremendous human resource potential is not being fully developed. Moreover, the coping skills developed by these couples may be modified and applied to other situations which create stress among students.

13. The role of married student housing needs to be investigated in terms of its effect on the marriage and on the development of important support systems.

14. Given the spouses' interdependence and the couple's independence and autonomy, a certain level of separation from the institution seems "healthy" and necessary for the student's continued personal development.

15. To what extent does the student's feeling of "loss of control" in his or her school life affect family functioning and the student's own sense of well-being?

A. Support Systems

The primary stabilizer for the doctoral student couple is the support received from the non-student spouse and parents, with that of the spouse being the most important. The family is usually considered to be a network resource willing or able to provide advice, support, or feedback (Tolsdorf, 1966), and it is the most accessible of all support systems (Caplan, 1974). This was supported by findings on doctoral student couples.

1. Support from Spouse: The spouse provides financial, emotional/psychological, academic, and basic needs support.

a. Financial support: This enables the student to remain in school and allows the family to continue functioning. Because of the important role marriage plays as a source of financial support, it is viewed as being very compatible with marriage, as a large percentage of married graduate students are supported in part by their spouses' income (Feldman, 1975).

(1) Employment of non-student spouse: The spouse's employment serves as the main source of income, although the student usually also works. The student wife always works, and her decision to return to school is based on her ability to locate adequate support for her education, which usually comes from stipends and fellowships. The need for her to be able to support her own education is a reflection of the traditional view of a woman's graduate education as being what Bernard (1964) refers to as an "economic luxury."

When the husband enrolls, the wife assumes the chief support role. Sometimes it is the first time she has worked, but usually she already holds a job. Her job usually has low prestige and few opportunities for advancement. McCoy (1979) describes the wife as frequently in a state of uncertainty, delaying her own development, working at an unchallenging job to support her hus-

band's education or supporting small children on an inadequate budget.

The wife's new position in the chief support role precludes risk-taking on the job which might threaten job security. Usually, however, she is satisfield in her new role and views it as a short-term investment toward long-term gains.

The husband now assumes more responsibility for managing the household and caring for the children. He does not experience feelings of inadequacy as a result of no longer being chiefly responsible for the support of his family, which conflicts with earlier findings by McCoy (1979).
This may be due to the wife's tendency to minimize her support role. She views her contribution as helping maintain the family and not toward sending her husband to school. It is speculated that cognitive dissonance accounts for the wife's attitude, i.e., if the marriage ends after graduation, she is less likely to feel cheated if she minimizes her support role. Also, she seems to feel it is necessary to confirm her husband's independence, which reflects traditional views about male independence.

Student marriages seem more vulnerable to conflict (Aller, 1963; Christensen & Philbrick, 1952; Dressell, 1965; Hall & Valine, 1977; Khan & Sharpley, 1976; Marchand & Langford, 1952; Marshall & King, 1966; Medalia, 1962; Rice, 1979), but there are no data on the rate of divorce among student marriages (Rice, 1979). It appears that such marriages would also be more vulnerable to postdoctorate divorce since the non-student wife may lose an important support role when her husband completes school.

Mueller (1960) suggests that the wife may become resentful about the tremendous sacrifice she must make during these critical years of her development. In fact, she may be plagued by the "degree-followed-by divorce"

syndrome. However, the doctoral student wife in this study exhibits no such fears and, in fact, seems pleased with her new role. She gains increased ability to influence outcomes and to negotiate important decisions, and she becomes more autonomous, independent, develops new skills and interests, clarifies career objectives, and improves her own educational skills via interaction with her husband. Further, her husband develops a heightened appreciation for her as a result of her commitment toward supporting his pursuits.

Sex role conflicts may occur, and the family frequently experiences role reversals (McCoy, 1979). However, the changes in what Rice (1979) refers to as the "power structure" within the family does not seem to affect marital relations. In fact, the student wife couple, which is typically more egalitarian, experiences few sex role reversals upon enrollment. The student husband couple becomes more cohesive and interdependent as a result of the role changes.

The husband is usually employed when his wife enrolls. If her schooling means that the family must relocate, he is willing to move but only after giving careful consideration to his own career and after devising a plan in which the move (1) does not penalize him professionally, (2) will not require extensive job-seeking effort on his part, and (3) will be for a two- or three-year period of time, after which the couple will relocate to a site determined by the wife's ability to find employment commensurate with her doctoral training. His professional career is usually advanced when the family relocates for the wife's matriculation.

The non-student wife, however, usually follows her husband without regard for her own professional development. Hembrough (1966) says her mobility is often determined by his change in employment, which also precludes her enrollment. She may find it difficult to find a job in the new area and must

often take a job lower in status than the one she left.

(2) Delayed gratification: A primary form of financial support is the couple's delay in acquiring goods and services during matriculation. The nature of the "investment" concept reserves all resources for the student's use, although this is not so prevalent among the student wife couple since it has fewer financial concerns. This couple tends to maintain its former standard of living after enrollment.

The tendency toward delayed gratification is also present in the student husband couple's decision about having children. Despite the wife's increasing age, the decision has usually already been made to postpone having children until after graduation, and little will change this decision until after the student has been admitted to candidacy. The student wife family is not influenced by this concept with regard to having children and feels school and children are compatible.

b. Emotional/psychological support: This form of support includes encouragement, listening to problems, sharing frustrations, and making the home more conducive for study by assuming certain responsibilities for managing the household and becoming more independent in making personal and financial decisions so as to free the student from them.

The psychological investment the spouse makes may prove disadvantageous to the student who may contemplate postponing or abandoning doctoral study but is made to feel guilty for not wanting to complete the degree.

The wife tends to give up all outside interests and friends if she feels they interfere with her support role. She is accessible to her husband as his needs demand. The non-student husband, while extremely helpful and supportive, is less likely to give up outside interests and activities, which may lead to greater marital astisfaction, as Straus (1980) found a close relation-

ship between satisfaction in leisure and leisure-time activities and marital satisfaction, especially for husbands.

The level of emotional/psychological support is higher if the husband already holds the doctorate since he has undergone a similar experience. It is reduced if the spouse has had no college experience at all, which precludes an understanding about certain aspects of being a student.

c. Academic support: A similarity of professional interests and/or academic backgrounds or levels between spouses allows for greater intellectual stimulation. The wife becomes heavily involved in her husband's school work, e.g., reading or typing papers and discussing ideas with him. These help reduce her feelings of isolation; give her a greater sense of purpose with regard to her support role; minimize the differences in educational levels; improve her ability to interact with him, his peers and professors; and reduce the likelihood that he will turn to others for support.

The wife admits that at times she may provide academic support so as to reduce opportunities for which her husband may have to turn to female classmates for help. It is known that school provides an increasing number of opportunities for the husband to interact with younger persons, especially those of the opposite sex (Rice, 1979).

The husband is only minimally involved in his wife's school work, and she prefers it this way. She views her education as a private matter although a joint undertaking and tends to use her accomplishments in school as a way of enhancing her own self-esteem, independence, and competence. Anxiety about criticism from her husband regarding her school work is also a factor in her desire to work alone.

A large percent of married students have high grade point averages, which supports earlier findings (Bergen & Bergen, 1976). The doctoral student's anxiety about making high grades lessens as more time is spent

in the program.

The wife's high level of involvement in her husband's work would appear to enhance his academic achievement more greatly than the student wife's performance, as she receives little academic support from her husband. Also, he is freed from more household responsibilities, which permits him more study time. But Von der Embse & Childs (1979) found that marital status is not a significant factor in men's academic performance although it is for women. No comparisons of grades were made among doctoral student couples.

The wife's role in helping her husband with his studies, he feels, results in improved performance and may also enhance marital relations by providing an opportunity for interaction. The wife, on the other hand, can find studying to be an isolating activity. Aller (1963) suggests that the wife who does well in school may do so at the expense of neglecting her family, or perhaps the unhappy and insecure wife may absorb herself in school work and strive for high grades to compensate for her dissatisfaction. The doctoral student wife seems to do well despite her various responsibilities and lack of academic help from her husband. The egalitarian quality of the marriage is, no doubt, a reflection of her independence, which is also manifested in her study habits.

If the husband holds the doctorate, which is likely in student wife couples, he may provide emotional/psychological support, since he has undergone a similar experience, but academic support is usually not given unless their fields are very closely related. No difference in the level of emotional support according to the non-student spouse's educational level was perceived.

d. Basic needs support: The student's increased absence from the home and involvement in school work while at home creates additional household responsibilities for the spouse, leading to a greater need to share roles

and to possible conflicts regarding the need to prioritize roles. Basic needs support include household or domestic duties, handling of family finances, and child care.

(1) Household duties: The student wife family is characterized as highly egalitarian in terms of its sex role orientation, and this factor seems to facilitate her ability to enroll. The husband is likely to assume shared responsibility for household tasks, while the student husband is likely to refer to his role as merely "helping out." Her enrollment, however, increases the likelihood that she will resume traditional roles because (a) of her more flexible time schedule, (b) she feels guilty about not contributing a greater share to family income, (c) she wants to remain an important and functioning family member, and (d) she actually feels that her husband lacks sufficient time to assist with household chores.

The student husband is less likely to feel guilty about not assuming a more active role in household management and usually expects his wife to become more accommodating as his needs demand. She may perceive inequity and unfairness in their new roles as time passes, which leads to negotiations about a more equitable distribution of work assignments.

(2) Child care: The husband, whether enrolled or not, assists greatly with child care responsibilities, which is related both to the enjoyment he derives from spending time with his children, and the need to care for children so that his wife may work, even though it sometimes interferes with his ability to study in the home. The spouses coordinate their class and work schedules and usually do not participate in outside activities without first conferring with each other. The husband's participation in child care is greatly improved if negotiations regarding his role as parent are made

prior to the birth of the child.

(3) Income management and budgeting: Management of family income is usually performed by the non-student spouse regardless of sex or of which had this responsibility prior to school. The student wife, however, may assume this task so as to free her husband of worries associated with her loss of income, or she may give up this responsibility because she often feels that her right to influence financial decisions decreases as her contribution to family income decreases.

2. Parental Support: Relatives are seen as primary sources of aid during crises, and friendship and kinship ties are extremely important (Collins & Pancoast, 1976). Sussman and Burchinall (1962) view the kin family network as an essential structure in family functioning: after marriage many couples continue to be involved in a network of mutual assistance with their families, especially with parents. The role of parental support among doctoral student couples is indicative of an extended family support network.

Parental assistance is seldom needed for basic needs support, and often the greatest form of support they provide is the assurance of their availability in the event they are needed. Since most parents have not attended college, they lack sufficient understanding about what study toward the doctorate entails. Moreover, they rarely understand a successful son's or daughter's motive for returning to school but yet remain supportive. Regarding financial support from them, the student husband is not likely to receive money from his parents but does get other forms of financial assistance from them. He usually does not accept money from his own parents because of his wife's vehement objection, which arises out of her (a) pride in being able to support the family, (b) fear that her husband will become dependent, (c) de-

sire to remain free of indebtedness and parental influences, and (d) her tendency to compare her husband's and her father's levels of independence.

Bergen and Bergen (1978) found that there is a greater tendency for the spouses to disagree on major decisions when the husband's family is a major source of income and a higher quality of marriage when the wife's parents provide support than when the husband's parents do. This is supported by couples in this study, in that the student husband's acceptance of support from his parents leads to marital conflicts, initiated by the wife's opposition. However, she readily accepts support from her own family, and he does not feel threatened by their offers to help, although he does consider it a matter of personal pride to not have to rely on them for support.

Parents of the student husband may provide support out of guilt that the wife now has to support the family or to repay her for the "sacrifice" they perceive she is making toward their son's education.

The student wife couple rarely receives support from parents, as the family is usually self-supporting and does not require additional support. Periodically gifts may be sent for special occasions. The couple uses savings and then a lending institution instead of parents to meet financial needs. The couple who experienced what appeared to be the highest level of dissatisfaction relies on loans as a major source of income. There was tension about how such loans were to be repaid and about the inadequate income that forced the couple to rely on loans. This finding lends support to the conclusion that there is a more frequent tendency for disagreement and dissatisfaction when loans are a source of income (Bergen & Bergen, 1978). These data confirm findings that marriage often frees the couple from parental support (Greenberg and DeCoster, 1976; Latange, 1962; Straus, 1980), and they

must learn to support themselves.

B. Marital Stability

The wife's return to school may precipitate threat of or an actual divorce, influenced by her new economic and professional roles, which may result in a new power structure in the family (Rice, 1979), sex role conflicts, and role reversals (McCoy, 1979) as she acquires increased ability to significantly influence outcomes and to negotiate important decisions. Another factor which affects marital stability is duration of marriage. Because of the doctoral student's age, his or her marriage is likely to be of longer duration, which may also be related to lower marital satisfaction (McKeon & Piercy, 1980). Since college study and preparation years represent a temporary situation (Christensen & Philbrick, 1962; Reimer, 1942), the doctoral student may also experience extremely high feelings of temporariness and marginality in this environment, which some researchers say is designed primarily for the unmarried young adult (Greenberg & DeCoster, 1976; Flores, 1975; Moore et al., 1972).

Despite problems faced by married students, there are positive factors in operation which seem to be more forceful than the problems encountered and which help to sustain the marriage (Khan & Sharpley, 1980).

Few studies have actually matched married students with non-student couples to determine if marital adjustment problems of married students are any greater than those which exist among married couples in general (Selby, 1972).

Studies show advantages of student marriages are more prevalent than disadvantages. Advantages are stabilizing effect, common goals, companionship, improved management of time and income, sex, pooled resources, love, maturing together (Christopherson et al., 1960), emotional security, greater incentive to succeed, home comforts, fewer social pressures, and more settled

life (Aller, 1963). Disadvantages include financial hardships, time shortage, early responsibilities, limited social life, children, delayed completion of degree, exclusion from college life, emotional tension, dropping out, inadequate study conditions, social isolation caused by low income, and interruption of long-range plans (Christopherson et al., 1960).

Reconciling the dual and often conflicting demands of the student-spouse role may help enhance marital stability rather than complicate marital relations. Several factors affect marital stability. An earlier study (Selby, 1972) had reported that the doctoral husband's marital problems are not influenced by his studies, and that the couple experiences no more stress than the young couple in which the husband is employed in a business.

1. Differences in educational levels: Despite earlier findings that differences in educational levels may threaten marital stability (Bergen & Bergen, 1978), the doctoral student's spouse does not feel threatened by the husband's or wife's enrollment and shows little interest in returning to school to help compensate for whatever differences may exist, which refutes earlier findings (Hembrough, 1966; McCoy, 1976; Schlundt, 1962; Selby, 1972). The student's enrollment may, in fact, convince the spouse not to pursue enrollment, particularly if it has adversely affected the marriage. The student's matriculation does seem to lead to clarification of the spouse's career goals, which may then lead to a decision to pursue additional studies or some form of training to meet specific career goals. The differences in educational levels may threaten one's self-esteem when there is interaction between the couple and student peers and/or professors. In such settings the student shows great concern for ensuring that the spouse feels at ease and may seek to include the spouse in conversations so as to reduce feelings of isolation and

to enhance the spouse's acceptability to the group. Ultimately the spouse may resolve the matter by simply not attending such events unless necessary.

Bergen and Bergen (1979) found that when only one spouse is enrolled, the quality of the marriage is higher if the husband is the student and considerably less when only the wife is enrolled. Also, a negative correlation between quality of marriage and husband's educational level up to the master's level was found. However, wives in graduate school may rank higher because their educational levels more nearly approach their husbands'. The non-student wife is not likely to already hold the doctorate, but the non-student husband does. McKeon & Piercy (1980) found no significant difference in marital adjustment by sex of enrolled spouse when only one spouse is in school. This study of doctoral students revealed no perceived differences in marital happiness by sex of enrolled spouse or educational level of non-student spouse.

The spouse may feel that the husband or wife is outgrowing him or her, but such fears do not appear serious or to threaten the marriage, and they usually dissipate once the spouse develops greater confidence in personal or professional skills, recognizes his or her importance to the spouse's completion of the degree, or engages in personal development activities so as to minimize the differences in educational levels. The student may minimize this role at home, which could create a continuing need for the student to sublimate achievements in order to appease the less well-educated spouse. The student may also help allay fears by complimenting the spouse's support role and recognizing that though the content of their knowledge may differ, the quality of it does not. The non-student husband is not likely to experience fears since he usually holds the doctorate and/or a prestiguous, well-paying professional position.

In marriages where the wife is matriculated, marital adjustment appears

to be positively determined by one's self-concept, and this is especially true when only the wife is enrolled (Hall & Valine, 1977). The study confirms this notion since the husband has a degree or position which enhances his self-concept prior to the wife's enrollment. Thus, he feels less threatened by his wife's education than the non-student wife feels about her husband's.

2. Financial problems: Adequate financial resources are one possible determinant of marital adjustment (Bergen & Bergen, 1978), although studies show that among married students financial problems and marital adjustment have a negative correlation (Christopherson et al, 1960). This was supported among doctoral students. Financial problems of married students are an important area of study since such problems adversely affect marital adjustment of students (Aller, 1963), but this seems true only when the couple who has not previously had financial problems now experiences serious ones. Married students also have higher expenses than single students and often must borrow money, become employed, or have the spouseswork (Geiken, 1972). Their expenses result from school, however, and not from additional purchases. Financial problems rank high among married students (DeLisle, 1965; Graff & Horne, 1973; Gruver & LaBadie, 1975; Khan & Sharpley, 1980), and married students need additional income, but these do not lead to marital instability.

Most problems identified by married students are financial in nature (Greenberg & DeCoster, 1976). Financial problems are also important in influencing the duration of graduate study (Wilson, 1965). But doctoral students' matriculation does not appear to be negatively affected by restricted income.

Among doctoral students in this study inadequate finances--though of primary concern--enhance rather than reduce marital stability. The couple's financial condition is accepted as a necessary aspect of graduate student life

with which they must cope. Happiness and the quality of life are not seen as being related to money, unless the couple has severe financial problems. Status is defined in terms of one's position as a doctoral student and the potential benefits to accrue upon completion of the degree, not on financial standing. This conflicts with earlier research reports that inadequate income is one of the chief concerns of married students in that it gives rise to a variety of other day-to-day needs and wishes, such as academic pressures, anxieties about postgraduation employment, and diverse domestic disturbances (Gottlieb, 1981).

The happier married graduate students are those without financial con-concerns, since freedom from such concerns helps stabilize their personal and emotional lives and enables them to shape their future according to other important needs (Latange, 1962). Among doctoral student couples however, it is the concern for financial and other "external" problems that actually seem to enhance marriage. The couple becomes more tolerant of its economic situation and develops a more cooperative relationship as a way to cope with financial strain brought on by their efforts to achieve an important life goal.

The couple's income, though it usually decreases upon enrollment, may actually improve as a result of increased effort to budget and the couple's modified spending habits. Actual income may also increase if (a) the student's stipend is tax free, (b) if the spouse's employment represents a new and additional income, and (c) if the couple relocates in order for the wife to attend school.

a. Attitudes toward financial stress: The couple is not debilitated or overly concerned about financial problems. Lack of prior experience with such problems may cause the student to characterize itself as poor and lead to some marital problems. The wife tends to accept their condition and does not

usually apply pressure on her husband to finish school unless (a) he has been enrolled for three years, (b) he has been enrolled continuously since completion of the master's, (c) they have or want children, or (d) she feels he is enjoying the student role more than the prospects of returning to work. The couple seldom makes installment purchases, and their standard of living is well below what it is expected to be after graduation, which the couple feels will be the onset of a higher standard of living. Christopherson and others (1960) found there is a lower aspiration for material items, and most seem willing to settle for positions that stress security, even if it means they forfeit greater financial rewards. Most of their happiness relates to their hope for advantages ahead (Mueller, 1960), which is reflected by the married student couple's recognition that the campus prestige system is not based on their income and that their situation is only temporary. These couples describe their lives as being "on hold" and they feel that financial problems are but a part of the price to pay for the eventual transition to a better way of life.

b. Coping behaviors: The couple budgets its income, although it does not rigidly adhere to its plan, as Straus (1980) also discovered. Major purchases the couple desires are house and car, followed by clothes and appliances. Installment purchases are seldom made since this means committing income that has not yet been earned.

The husband usually manages his own income and uses it primarily to support his education. The wife, however, tends to view hers as a part of the total family income and is less likely to designate it for education alone.

The student wife couple is more financially secure than the student husband couple, as measured by home ownership and location of home in a prestiguous or suburban neighborhood. It seeks to maintain its former standard of

living, which is usually possible, although not so with the student husband couple. One of the first activities the couple gives up as a result of lower income is outside entertainment, which may lead to some marital problems since the couple considers occasional "getting away from it all" to be conducive to stability. The couple usually preceives its financial condition to be better than that of other doctoral student couples, which is an effective coping mechanism. Moreover, the current way of life is valued more highly than the couple's lifestyle prior to enrollment or than any alternative lifestyle the couple would otherwise be engaged in. "Stress optimization", "stress mitigating strategies" (Skinner, 1980), and "tension management techniques" (Paloma, 1971) help the couple in accepting financial problems more readily.

3. Social Relationships: Financial problems reduce the couple's ability to develop social relationships since there is a reduction in activities that provide opportunities for meeting new people and socializing with friends. The couple may begin to rely on home entertainment more, but this may cause problems for the non-student wife who may be embarrassed by the inadequacy of the home and its furnishings. Relationships with friends obtained prior to enrollment are not necessarily affected by the couple's lower income.

4. Time Pressures: While some married students can be together on a regular basis in pursuing outside interests, exchanging ideas, discussing issues, laughing together, and working on projects (Bergen & Bergen, 1978), one of the most significant problems facing married graduate students relates to time: to study, to spend with family, for leisure and relaxation, for completing household responsibilities, and for meeting other demands of their dual roles. Married students have little time to spend with each other (Busselen & Busselen, 1975). Time represents the couple's most important problem: fatigue, can't get everything done, can't find time to be together, and hus-

band's unwillingness to do his share of household responsibilities (Mueller, 1960). Lee (1960) found time to be the source of most problems among married students.

A major complaint of doctoral student couples relates to time problems, i.e., demands of home, school, and work, which leave little time and opportunity for the spouses to be together or with their children, to develop or continue social relationships, or to participate in social activities. Time problems are usually exacerbated when children are present because of the added child care and household responsibilities they create. Scheduling time becomes an important matter in resolving time conflicts.

a. Time management: School may actually increase the amount of time the couple has to spend together, as the flexibility of time enables the spouses to coordinate their schedules more easily.

Scheduling and routinization are required to cope with all the demands lest the couple finds itself in an "iron grip" (Busselen & Busselen, 1975). Because time is so limited, the couple is likely to feel free time should be protected and spent wisely. Activities, individuals, and other factors which do not aid the student in accomplishing goals are viewed as intrusions or obstacles. The couple may lose interest in activities unrelated to school or completion of the degree, which may further isolate the couple and alienate them from acquaintances and peers.

The role given priority at any one time is usually the one which has the greatest level of immediate importance or urgency, and this may alternate from home to school, and vice versa. Primarily it is through cooperation, understanding, awareness of each other's needs, and respect for each other's involvements in individual pursuits that the couple is able to meet the demands

efficiently and effectively.

b. Spending time with spouse: The husband and wife may have to employ various strategies to obtain even a limited amount of time together (Schiavo, 1978). The physical and emotional separation caused by school also leads to sex and communication problems, the latter of which relates primarily to lack of time to talk (Gruver & Labadie, 1975).

"Tunnel vision," "myopia," and "obsession" with completion of the degree are all terms used by students and their spouses to suggest the importance of the student roles. Usually the non-student wife is the first to become aware of the increased physical and emotional separation and to seek means for reversing this situation, as she experiences the separation more severely.

One way to resolve the dilemma is to schedule time to be together, which involves eliminating outside activities that may occur during times not already committed to school or work. The routinization of the student's school life seems to facilitate scheduling in one's personal life.

Scheduling time to be together may not always be feasible, and there is always the likelihood of interruptions and cancellations, both of which produce additional anxiety.

One or both spouses may become possessive about the time designated to be spent together, and often special permission must be gained from the other in order to be exempted. Violations of the agreement may lead to resentment and anger. The non-student spouse expects that study time will be spent wisely so that it does not interfere with time to be spent alone.

Yamamoto (1965) found that married student housing residents rarely engage in creative activities and that social activities are not of major concern to them. Thus, although spending time together is considered im-

portant, how it is spent is often of minor importance. Usually the couple engages in non-creative activities, e.g., movies, television, dinner, and talking to one another. Going outside the home for entertainment is usually reserved for special occasions. The presence of children, inadequate financial resources, and time constraints reduce the couple's ability to engage in outside activities.

The doctoral student couple shows little tendency to have engaged in outside activities even prior to enrollment, which may mean that doctoral programs are disproportionately represented by students having low social needs. Moore and others (1972) suggest that their social needs are low because the couple's basic needs have not been met.

5. Communication: Patterns of communication may be altered as a result of unavailability of time, preoccupation with school-related demands and expectations, and the physical and mental exhaustion which may reduce the desire to talk or listen. The results may be increased friction and disagreements. A spouse may withhold feelings for fear of hurting the other, since sufficient time is not available for full exploration of feelings and attitudes or to resolve any problems which might erupt. However, these conditions, especially time constraints, may lead spouses to become more concise and focused in communicating with one another. Selby (1972) found that doctoral study has no effect on marital communication between couples.

Topics of conversation revolve around home, school, and children, if any, and seldom include world and political events unless the student is majoring in an area where such events are emphasized. Conversations about school and work are seldom discussed in technical terms, which may have a negative effect on the quality and level of communication.

As more time is spent in the marriage relationship, the spouses become more

at ease, and there is greater tendency to be open and candid without fear of hurting or offending one another. This would appear to be a result of improved marital relations. However, earlier studies suggest that there is a negative correlation between mutual marital satisfaction and length of marriage, with marriages of five years duration or less having significantly higher marital adjustment scores and mutual marital satisfaction than those of more than five years (Chu & Bergsma, 1978; McKeon & Piercy, 1980). Thus, it seems that the longer the couple's marriage (over five years), the less improved marital relations become. Among doctoral student couples, however, duration of marriage seems to correspond positively with marital satisfaction, and it is the challenging experience of doctoral study to which many couples in part attribute the success of their marriages.

In couples in which only the husband is enrolled, communication is seen as a positively more serious problem, due in part to the lack of involvement of both spouses in the same kind of life (Price-Bonham, 1966). Though not enrolled, the wife is highly involved in her husband's schooling, which would seem to enhance communication, especially with regard to school. The earlier finding, therefore, cannot be supported.

6. Children: The presence or number of children does not negatively affect marital stability among doctoral student couples. Earlier results, however, show that children are seen as having a potentially negative effect on marital adjustment (Chu & Bergsma, 1978; Marshall & King, 1966; Price-Bonham, 1966). Parent couples in this study, however, seem to feel that having children actually improve the marriage. The non-student wife who does not have children seems to become less satisfied with the decision not to have children as she approaches or passes age thirty. Continued delay may create

some conflict among husband and wife, since she may view the possibility of never having children becoming more likely as her age increases.

Low income and the added responsibility of academic work are primary reasons for the added psychological and emotional burden of parenthood among married university students (Hurley & Palonen, 1967). Doctoral student couples, however, refute the notion of children contributing to family problems, with the exception of some child care considerations which may lead to a more confining and restricted lifestyle.

a. Family planning: An important problem of student couples concerns discipline of children and whether or not to have children (Gruver & Labadie, 1975). There are conflicting opinions held by student husbands and student wives on this issue of having children while enrolled.

(1) Student husband: Children are viewed by the childless couple as consuming exhorbitant amounts of time and money, to the extent that they are believed to interfere with the husband's ability to continue in school. His wife, however, desires to have children before her age becomes a factor in risks associated with childbirth. She is more fearful about postponing having children until his graduation if she is nearing or has passed age thirty.

Children are seen as a financial burden, as interfering with study time (Marshall & King, 1966) and are reasons for emotional strain (Holmstrom & Holmstrom, 1974). These represent the student husband's major concerns about having children while in school. As he nears completion he develops a more relaxed attitude about having children, since they are now perceived as less disruptive to his continued schooling. The couple may become less careful about using birth control methods although will not usually make a conscious decision to have a child. Both spouses begin to develop more positive feelings

about having children, but economic reasons continue to be the primary reason for wanting to postpone children until after graduation, a finding that has been supported by previous study (Christopherson et al., 1960).

(2). Student wife: She is not likely to postpone having children. Primary reasons are increasing age and greater flexibility of time for pregnancy and childrearing. She sees being in school as an opportune time to have children. Schlundt (1962) found children to be one of the main reasons wives do not return to school. Unwanted pregnancies have delayed or eliminated college altogether for some wives (Lee, 1960), which leads to resentment (Aller, 1963). The doctoral student wife, however, does not drop out of school because of children, which makes previous findings tenuous.

Having children while in school seems more typical of the upper social class, since the student wife family is more likely to consider school and children as being compatible, and she has a higher socioeconomic standing. Eshleman and Hunt (1967) had found that having children while in college violates upper social class norms and that lower socioeconomic class students were more likely to have children while enrolled.

b. Effects of Children on Studying and Attendance: Parental responsibilities appear to be more demanding for student wives than for student husbands. However, the egalitarianism of the student wife couple means that she is freed from many household responsibilities. Despite the many responsibilities assumed by the non-student wife, she seems to provide greater amounts of basic needs, emotional/psychological, and academic support to her husband than the non-student husband provides his wife.

Children are viewed as distractions from studies because of the student's desire to spend time with them. Because child care is often so exhausting, it precludes studying in the home. Children do not appear to affect school

attendance since both parents coordinate school and work schedules so well. The amount of time devoted to studying does not seem to be affected by children, but place for studying often is, as Eshleman and Hunt (1967) found.

c. Effects of Parent's Schooling on Children: A major problem is lack of time to spend with children because of graduate student responsibilities (DeLisle, 1965). Aside from children's disappointment over a parent's inability to spend more time with them, school does not appear to have an ostensible negative effect on children. The reduction in family income as a result of a parent's enrollment may create feelings of guilt, especially if the student feels he or she has prioritized educational needs above the child's.

d. Child Care: The need for outside child care is greatly reduced as a result of inadequate financial resources and time constraints. Nevertheless, studies (Flores, 1975; Graff & Horne, 1973; Hembrough, 1966) have found child care to be a major problem for married students who have children. The couple usually cannot locate or afford suitable child care and does not have the time for outside social engagements. Thus, children may negatively affect marital relations since the couples consider it essential to occasionally have time alone away from the children.

e. Effects of Children on Social Relationships: Because children often confine the couple to the home, they reduce the couple's participation in activities which could foster the development of new relationships or enable the couple to maintain present ones. They reduce spontaneity in social participation, thus perhaps lessening the couple's association with childless couples because of the need to plan. Children may, on the other hand, help foster social interaction between parents and others with children of similar ages. Mutual interests in children creates opportunities for conversation and participation in child-related activities. Children, however, have little

influence on the development of close or supportive relationships between parents, which negates Gottlieb's (1981) findings. The student couple, especially when the wife is enrolled, enjoys a lifestyle that is incongruent with the more traditional lifestyle of its neighbors, which makes them feel "out of sync" with neighbors. They associate with them only minimally and for specific short-term purposes and do not show mutual support or caring.

f. Effects of Children on Parent's Opportunity for Privacy and Intimacy: Schiavo (1980) found that children detract from the quality of the immediate interpersonal experience among couples by interfering with the spouse's display of affection, inhibiting discussion of certain issues, and limiting their engagement in activities seen as essential to the marital relationship.

Parents' usual confinement to the home because of time, money, and other factors associated with children may require that they create opportunities for privacy and intimacy within the home, which may be extremely difficult to accomplish unless strategies are devised. Such tactics include sending the child outside to play, taking advantage of time in which the child is engaged in activities away from the home, and performing household tasks together. While the parents may sometimes need to be authoritative with older children so as to ensure having some time alone, they must also make sure there are opportunities to include children in some discussions and activities so that the children will not feel alienated or neglected.

7. Role Conflict: Married students have specific problems germane to their combined roles of student and spouse and perhaps also as parent and employee (Falk, 1964; Large, 1980). Resolving these roles may affect marital relations.

Feldman (1975) found that the extent to which married students adhere to traditional sex roles determines the degree of conflict between their dual

roles. He speculates that some women may remain single so as to avoid the possible student-spouse role conflict, and that others may end their marriage to alleviate conflict caused by these roles. In terms of ending the marriage to resolve role conflict, data on doctoral couples do not support this.

Yamomoto (1965) found that husbands spent most of their time studying and the least amount of time performing household work and child care. Wives spent most of their time at work, and performing household work and child care, which is supported by doctoral student wives in this study.

The doctoral student couple lacks a peer group of married student couples. The partners develop a high level of confidence in the appropriateness of their lifestyle as a student couple. They do not feel it is deviant or allow others' opinions to shape their behaviors or decisions. They may conveniently breach societal marriage patterns in order to develop a lifestyle that is congruent with their needs and interests. The fluidity and anonymity of student life often makes certain behaviors acceptable that would be unacceptable in the larger culture, e.g., a non-student wife going out alone with one of her husband's fellow male students. Behaviors may be justified on the basis of the "holding pattern" quality they ascribe to their lives.

8. Sexual Problems: The couple's sexual life may be affected by the demands created by conflicts in school and work schedules, and, to a lesser extent, by exhaustion. One spouse may begin to initiate sexual relations more frequently than in the past. Sex may be viewed by an exhausted spouse as a means of stimulating oneself, and it may also be viewed as a pleasurable way for both spouses to become tired together. Conflict in sleeping patterns may alter sexual activity, not necessarily its frequency. Each recognizes and accepts that at times sex may be engaged in for the benefit of one spouse and

not the other. The need to "show love" was presented as an important factor in marital happiness, and the couple is likely to engage in "romantic" behaviors frequently. These findings support earlier studies (Latange, 1962) about satisfactory sex lives among student couples. Gruver & Labadie (1975) however, found sexual problems to be the number one complaint among married college students, due primarily to frequency and time of day. A major problem was fatigue and not "showing love" (Bergen & Bergen, 1978).

9. Decision-Making: Multiple demands on the couple's time and energy may result in one spouse, especially the non-student spouse, having to make decisions with only minimal input from the other. Immediate decisions may be made alone, but "important" ones usually involve some contact between spouses. The process is informal and expeditious.

Enrollment may actually reduce the student's influence on decisions and increase the spouse's, such as when the non-student wife begins working and making concomitant financial decisions. The student wife, however, may relinquish some of her influence on decision-making because she tends to feel that her right to influence decisions is based on the amount of her financial contribution to family income. She may withdraw her influence as the proportion of her income decreases.

Financial decisions made independently are usually guided by a preestablished dollar amount which neither spouse may exceed without approval.

C. Social Relationships and Interaction:

The university environment offers increased opportunities for the student to meet and interact with fellow students and faculty, but it does not necessarily facilitate the development of intimate relationships. Establishing social relationships with ones peers, however, is not of major concern to the

doctoral student couple. Peers serve a temporary and sparodic function, and the relationships often lack the quality and purpose for becoming enduring and meaningful relationships. Moore and others (1972) state that perhaps basic needs are given higher priority among married students, and social needs may not be fulfilled because basic needs have not been met. Further, based on findings by Gottlieb (1981), heavy participation in extracurricular activities greatly reduces one's success in developing meaningful support networks. Since the family is the primary support system, its maintenance precludes a high level of social interaction elsewhere. Lee (1960) holds that the demands of being a spouse simply leave little time for peer interaction, recreational activities, and others which contribute to personal development.

Mueller (1960) found that where socializing is desirable, a top priority among married students is in recreation, and this usually involves getting together with neighbors. But he added that they feel isolated from participation in such activities. Emotional strain and lack of financial resources were found to be deterrents to regular participation. Among married doctoral students, financial and time constraints are the major factors which preclude interaction in recreation and leisure time activities. Association with neighbors is limited by what the student couple perceives as an incongruity in their individual lifestyles.

Like students in Geiken's (1972) study, married doctoral students view campus activities as unsuitable, seldom participate in them, and rank them lower than do single students. They do express some interest in meeting other doctoral student couples with whom they may share experiences as student couples. However, no aggressive efforts are initiated to identify

such couples or to establish social interaction. The doctoral student tends to see the initiation of social relationships as a potential intrusion on one's time and for this reason is reluctant to form new ones.

The student's matriculation may in ways isolate him or her from working couples. Dressell (1965) suggests that they lack access to young married couples in the professional or business world and may feel isolated, insecure, and unable to live up to the social obligations of these other couples. The doctoral student couple, however, seems to not desire association with working couples since such interaction may necessitate reciprocation of elaborate entertainment and activities which the student couple simply cannot afford.

1. Change in Student's Interests: Married students have less time than unmarried students to spend for activities unrelated to their goals, and they are more vocationally oriented and tend to engage primarily in activities that will help them achieve their goals (Busselen & Busselen, 1975). Indeed, enrollment brings about new interests, attitudes, and behaviors, which may alienate old friends. Also, school demands limit the student's availability for social participation. The new environment leads to greater spontaneity in association between students and increased interaction with fellow students, and new associations are likely to be formed as a result of the students' mutual interest in school. These may replace former relationships, and interaction with old friends becomes less frequent and more irregular. Individuals are more likely to develop mutually supportive relationships with others who share similar experiences and lifestyles (Gottlieb, 1981). The purpose served by former friends no longer exists or it continues to be filled by irregular association with them.

Attainment of the degree becomes a central focus of the student couple's

life, and those activities, individuals, and interests which interfere with degree completion may simply be abandoned or neglected. Educational interests and objectives replace interest in social activities and the development of social relationships. Former friends may lack thorough understanding about the student's new life. Association becomes even more infrequent, (a) if former associates develop a negative attitude about the student's enrollment, (2) if they are engaged in behaviors that are not socially acceptable or which the student feels will interfere with his or her completion of the degree, and (3) if they do not aspire toward higher goals. The student may even view them as deterrents to goal accomplishment. The bonds that held the relationship together begin to dissipate as school takes on a more important role.

Former associates themselves may decrease interaction with the student if they view the student role as representing a lowering in status. On the other hand, the student role may actually enhance one's social status. New and old acquaintances may be reluctant to develop or sustain relationships with the doctoral student because of the aura associated with doctoral study. Pursuit of the degree, thus, alienates some former friends and prevents new relationships from forming because of differences in educational levels.

Social support networks are essential to one's social adaptability and personal well-being (Gottlieb, 1981). Further, he suggested in the study that when individuals are faced with a crisis or distress situation, their emotional organization and relational arrangements must be altered, new ways to deal with the situation must be devised, and new sources of support must be found to enhance their well-being. Inappropriate former relationships may be abandoned or altered and new ones developed. Concerns, goals, and sense of self may have to be modified. In a transition state they may find that friends and family do not share their new situation and that their

problems are uniquely different from those experienced by others in the community. They may feel marginal to the community and socially isolated. Thus, it becomes important for them to have access to a temporary community comprised of others in a similar situation who are able to identify with their experiences and accept them (Caplan & Killilea, 1976).

The married student couple, therefore, may be forced to develop relationships with others having similar circumstances, e.g., other students, since friends outside the university may neither understand nor appreciate the married student's new situation or be able to empathize or provide the appropriate help when necessary. Married students may experience isolation and find it necessary to adopt a new sense of self as student. This new identity may in itself be painful. It is during this time that association with fellow students would seem of utmost importance in helping the student make the transition and to accept the new identity. If former friends alienate the student and criticize the new role, the change becomes more painful and traumatic, since alienation is seen as helping to confirm a loss of status.

The non-student wife is likely to abolish relationships with former friends because her interests tend to change to become more congruent with her husband's. She may discontinue associating with those friends who do not understand or appreciate her new interests.

The student may also consciously limit the extent of association with fellow students because of a need for greater diversity so that life does not totally center around school. The student's age, sex, race, and whether or not he or she has children are but some of the factors which might interfere with the development of close social relationships with one's peers.

2. Absence of Peer Group of Married Doctoral Students: The married student couple's problems may be exacerbated by their tendency to compare their behavior with that of other non-student couples. Because they lack a reference group comprised of other married students by which behavior can be modeled, they may be unable to identify coping skills applicable to their new situation.

For the married student couple the single student's more liberated and casual lifestyle is inappropriate. However, efforts are not made to develop relationships with married students, and one reason is because they are perceived to be under similar time and financial constraints, which preclude hope of finding mutually convenient times for interaction. Flores (1975) found that married students do attach some importance to participation in activities that allow them to develop meaningful relationships, and interaction with other student families is considered a serious problem among married students (Greenberg & DeCoster, 1976).

3. Support Role of Spouse and Family: Some married students with personal problems may isolate themselves from peer contacts and rely instead only on spouse, kin, or professional services for help (Gottlieb, 1981). The support provided by the spouse and parents leaves few unmet needs. Social interaction with peers is, then, given a low priority. This high level of interdependence and cooperation increases to the extent that the need for friends as a source of social support is significantly reduced. Former acquaintances play a less important role as the marriage becomes more cohesive and gains more strength. This, of course, may create a strain on the relationship, since lack of interaction with others may cause one partner to develop unrealistic expectations about the relationship and about the role of the other spouse.

Parents also provide support and opportunities for social interaction. They may serve as a social outlet and as intimate friends, which further

decreases the need to rely on peers for support and social interaction.

4. Special Needs of the Non-student Spouse: The non-student spouse's self-concept may complicate attempts to make new friends if he or she does not feel at ease in the presence of the spouse's fellow students. The differences in educational levels, feelings of isolation from the university community, and the need for one to have his or her own friends may affect the development of new relationships with other students. The non-student may feel insecure or inferior about the differences in educational levels. This may lead to the need to have one's own peer group separate from the university community. School associates may be rejected if the non-student spouse feels they do not share or appreciate his or her individual interests and goals.

Most of the couple's friends are likely to have been developed through the student spouse, which supports Feldman's (1975) findings. They are either formed through school or student employment, and this is true regardless of the student's sex. The non-student spouse is likely to have few, if any, friends of his or her own, even though the need for having one's own friends may from time to time seem important, especially to the non-student wife.

Feldman (1975) found that the husband tends to feel his wife spends too much time with friends, and the wife seems more concerned that he has different friends. These findings could not be supported by data on doctoral student couples.

The non-student wife has greater proclivity for developing relationships with her husband's classmates than with his female classmates. The female student may feel that the wife represents the traditional female role from which she as a student may be trying to escape. The non-student wife may feel threatened by the female student's independence and may view her as representative of what the non-student wife herself cannot or has not become.

His male classmates are less threatening and may even serve as somewhat of an outlet for her at social engagements since she does not usually have her own friends. The non-student husband is more likely than the non-student wife to have his own outside interests, which reduces the need for reliance on his wife's classmates. He tends to spend little time in the university community, thus further reducing the possibility for interaction with students.

5. Expectations of Friends and the Role of Former Friendships: Both the student and the non-student husbands have high expectations of friends, which decreases the likelihood for forming lasting relationships in the university or residential community. Social relationships are likely to remain somewhat superficial, and interaction may be sporadic. He does not aggressively seek new friendships and does not feel that new acquaintances can take the place of his long-lasting friendships, which are based on many years of association and various situations in which the friendships have been tested and proven genuine.

6. Fear of Ending Friendships: Since the student and newly formed friends are likely to pursue different career paths subsequent to graduation, the potential for having to end association with friends may not justify making new ones. The pain associated with ending friendships may be so traumatic that the student prefers superficial relationships and perhaps even isolation and loneliness during the period of study rather than risk ending them after a few years. Such fears are even more pronounced if the student has already relocated in order to attend school.

7. Role of Professional Helpers in Resolving Personal Problems: Married students seldom use college counselors and other helping professionals (Geiken, 1972; Gottlieb, 1981; Greenberg & DeCoster, 1976; Horne & Wagner, 1974; Oppelt, 1965). Couples show a preference for friends, faculty, and relatives rather than on-campus counseling resources (Greenberg & DeCoster, 1976).

Married students' infrequent use of counseling services may indicate they use other social relationships to meet their counseling needs. Or perhaps they have an increased ability to cope with emotional problems and tensions more capably than unmarried students (Oppelt, 1965). It is the latter that is substantiated by findings on doctoral students.

The support role of the non-student spouse and parents eliminates need for outside support groups in resolving crises and making decisions. The couple tends to rely upon an outside professional resource rather than friends when personal problems develop. Having close friends intervene in personal matters is potentially damaging to the relationship, and one's personal friends are not likely to understand the unique circumstances of the doctoral student couple.

Professional resources are seen as unbiased by the couple, but campus counseling services are viewed as being partial since the student's association with the university removes the neutrality of this resource. Often the couple forgets the availability of campus counseling services, and perhaps this is related to isolation from the university community. Since one or both of the spouses has usually sought professional help in the past, this resource is simply renewed when personal problems develop during enrollment.

8. Financial Concerns: The change in the student couple's financial circumstances may not affect the maintenance of former relationships but does interfere with the development of new social relationships. Old friends tend to maintain their same standard of living, which often does not preclude the student couple's participation in some activities with them.

9. Children: Children's association with one another in the neighborhood and at school may lead to some interaction among parents but not neces-

sarily to lasting friendships. Children can also restrict their parents freedom to participate in social activities, and the need for child care limits spontaneity and requires additional expenses which the couple cannot afford.

10. Integration into Community: The student couple has little if any desire to become an integral part of the community. Time, effort, and money restrict participation in activities that would permit association with other families. Since the student couple feels that neighbors are involved in a more conventional and therefore very different lifestyle, the couple is constrained in its attempts to broaden its social affiliation with them.

D. Status:

The student role comprises only one aspect of the married student's total identity. There are other important roles and responsibilities which also help to define one's status, including that of spouse, parent, and employee.

1. Importance of Other Roles: To the extent that one sees the student role as being demeaning or unfulfilling, it becomes increasingly necessary that other tasks and responsibilities be altered in order to improve one's feelings of self-worth. One may become more heavily involved in work and/or assume greater family responsibilities so as to develop or maintain a sense of purpose and importance. Having other roles to play minimizes the student role such that self-esteem is maintained even if a loss of status is experienced when becoming a student.

2. Attitudes Toward Student Role: If the student feels that the knowledge and skills gained from pursuit of the doctorate will assist in becoming a professional or will lead to more challenging career opportunities, then becoming a student takes on greater importance. The ability to realize dreams and set new goals for oneself increases the likelihood that the student role

will be perceived as meaningful. As a result of successful progression through the doctoral program, the student may actually improve his or her self-confidence. Many students (and their spouses) report heightened self-esteem as a result of pursuing doctoral study.

If the student views the doctoral program as representing a series of "jumping through hoops", then becoming a student is demoralizing and represents perhaps the lowest form of status. It may arouse anger and resentment and lead to feelings of helplessness or to loss of control of one's life. Sometimes this loss in status may be moderated by the high value the student attributes to other roles or to other accomplishments in areas that are unrelated to school work, such as owning one's own company or having published.

3. Need to Separate Personal and Academic Life: The student prefers to be divorced from the college environment. There is a desire to interact within the college environment and a desire to not have one's personal life affected by parietal regulations and influences. This is demonstrated in both the student's tendency to not participate in campus activities and in the decision to live away from the campus area.

Married students do not feel that intervention from the university should be imposed to help foster greater social interaction. They express self-reliance, social competence, and spontaneity in social processes (Gottlieb, 1981). They see the role of the institution as being academic and do not expect it to meet their social or personal needs. The couple also may not want to be influenced by traditional student activities or to subject the family to the limitations imposed by campus living. Further, living off campus helps the student perserve those other identities beside that of student.

4. Prioritizing Student and Other Roles: The demands associated with being a student often forces other roles further down one's list of priorities. The commitment to school and the "sacrifices" that the student and family have already made toward degree attainment keep the student role in high priority. Sometimes other roles may be neglected altogether because of the importance ascribed to the student role. This may cause role conflict, especially if the other areas of one's life are neglected too severely. But such conflicts are easily resolved since individuals in these other areas, e.g., spouse and children, do not feel that they have been abandoned altogether, and there has been some prior agreement that the student role will generally always be given highest priority. The non-student spouse may have a passive attitude about having to take the "back seat" in the relationship and feel quite satisfied that the spouse eventually gives the attention desired. This, of course, may lead to further neglect if the student takes the marriage for granted or assumes "it will take care of itself." This is likely to occur during the early phase of one's enrollment, when becoming acclimated to the university environment and one's new roles may be so overwhelming that it leads to gross neglect of other responsibilities, or when the student becomes engrossed in completion of the dissertation. Prioritizing roles is a continuous process, and such decisions must be made on an ongoing and constant basis.

Married women seem to be able to successfully manage their dual roles so that academic performance is not diminished, and this is especially important when understood in the context that marriage adds increasing responsibilities and time demands for the married woman student (Lee, 1960). She has a greater tendency to want to end the student role, and perhaps this is associated with the differential in sex role responsibilities. The student husband tends to enjoy being a student more than does the student wife. Being married and

in school provides greater advantages for the student husband than for the student wife, whose responsibilities may actually increase when she enrolls.

5. Use of Enrollment and Grades as Measures of Status: The student may view pursuit of the degree as a scale on which to measure one's success or status. Grades may be seen as an indication of success, and the tendency to compare grades so as to measure one's worth helps to support the student's belief that enrollment enhances one's status. Grades are seen as a more accurate indication of one's ability to perform since each student supposedly has equal opportunity to earn grades and to excel. The one who does well academically receives confirmation in the form of high grades. Or, the mere fact that one is enrolled in a doctoral program seems to confirm status, since the student believes that those with less superior qualities are not admitted. Even if one does not complete the degree, he or she feels that acceptance into the program and matriculation in it are signs of accomplishment. To others the enjoyment of the student role and the learning process make pursuit of the degree worthwhile.

Completion of the degree is believed to definitely enhance one's status even if the student does not consider this the number one reason for enrolling in the program. The concept of "investment" confirms the student's belief that the degree will bring benefits, which are described as improving one's lifestyle, enabling one to make better choices, having a greater variety of options available, enjoying a greater degree of personal freedom, and making the student more acceptable professionally since the doctorate has credentialing ability.

6. Non-student Spouse's Perception of Status: While the spouse does not feel that he or she will perceive the student any differently after completion of the degree, there are feelings of pride associated with the spouse's

enrollment. The non-student spouse's self-perception is not expected to change after the degree has been completed, since his or her identity is not usually defined in association with the student, which refutes Feldman's (1975) findings, but instead is determined through one's employment.

7. Becoming Professional: Pursuit of the degree is seen as a means for enhancing one's skills and capabilities. From the selection of courses taken to the tasks assigned through the graduate associateship, the student is likely to view his or her education as being beneficial for attainment of career goals since it leads to professional development and career advancement. There is reduced preoccupation with making high grades as the student comes to place more and more emphasis on obtaining knowledge and developing important skills.

Both the courses and contacts one makes with other individuals while pursuing the degree are important to professional development. They help the student acquire important skills for entry into the profession. From faculty, co-workers, and other students one learns about appropriate roles and expectations associated with future professional employment. If the student feels that making important contacts is more beneficial than the actual course of study, then there is less satisfaction with the course content, and more time is spent cultivating relationships that will be professionally rewarding both now and in the years ahead.

The graduate associateship is viewed as an opportunity for professional growth and development, and it may be personally gratifying and challenging. Satisfaction with this work is closely related to satisfaction with one's graduate program. The student may, in fact, come to identify himself or herself in relation to the position as a graduate associate more than as a student.

The student's relationship with faculty and advisers is conducive to developing the knowledge and behaviors that will contribute to professional development. Professors and advisers who do not spend time with their students are not seen as helpful and may cause the student to become resentful. The helpful adviser or faculty is one who serves as an example and who provides guidance to the student in making career decisions. He or she also challenges the student to expend more effort than the student might otherwise and helps the student grow from an apprentice to a professional.

Opportunities made available through the associateship contribute to the student's professional development if the assignments of the position offer challenges for growth. If not, dissatisfaction is aroused, and the student is likely to perceive his or her responsibilities as perfunctory and non-beneficial. When there is a good match, the student tends to view the associateship and the program of study as being highly complementary.

8. Locus of Control: Becoming a student means that one has to conform to certain university rules and regulations and expectations which may restrict one's sense of personal freedom. The "political" nature of the academic environment may cause the student to feel helpless in shaping the direction of his or her life. The demands from instructors and the institution accord the student reduced freedom in making important decisions or engaging in activities associated with professional development. Selection of courses is restricted somewhat, although some degree of freedom is allowed since the student may take courses outside the prescribed program of study. The student may also have little choice about work assignments as a graduate associate, which confirms loss of control of one's life.

The confidence the student has in the ability of the persons making deci-

sions helps reduce the intensity of loss of power and control. Or the student may personally invent some strategy for playing his or her own games in a sense of "one-upmanship." Finally, the student may simply adopt the attitude that the importance of the degree is much higher than the loss of freedom associated with having to comply with the controls established by someone else.

The powerlessness felt in the academic world does not manifest itself in other aspects of the student's life. Since other roles are also of value and importance, loss of control in the student role may not be felt as intensely or be as debilitating. Further, the loss of control is dealt with in a variety of ways so that the student is not debilitated by no longer being able to make important life decisions.

The non-student spouse, especially the wife, may experience a lack of control in one's own life because of the constraints imposed by the student's matriculation. The non-student husband is less likely to feel a severe loss of control since his wife is expected to adhere to a time schedule for completion. He has little need to postpone his career plans while his wife is enrolled. The non-student wife, however, often has to postpone her own plans and goals and rely on her husband's completion of the degree before she may make career decisions or moves. Thus, she experiences a greater loss of control.

Because of the freedom associated with choosing a major, with selecting courses, committee members and class schedules, and with making career decisions, the student may feel that becoming a student offers an opportunity for one to take charge of his or her life. There is a sense of freedom associated with being a student that exceeds the freedom one may experience on the job. Further, by pursuing a course of study the student is able to make and follow through on important life and career decisions.

While a "married student culture" was originally felt to exist, the findings of this study on married doctoral students revealed that these students closely resemble mainstream Americana and do not exist as a separate culture. Their problems and concerns are in many ways similar to those experienced by married couples in the larger society. Yet there remains some traits which are uniquely characteristic of married students. These confirm the notion of "marginality," and it is these students' marginality that sets them apart from the larger society. They refer to their lives as being "on hold" and perceive a definite change (usually a lowering) in status as a result of changes in income, loss of control of one's life, conformity to university regulations and expectations, and so on. They are, in a sense, becoming professionals, although many of them have previously worked in professional positions. Completion of the doctorate allows them to re-enter society as credible professionals, and receipt of the degree is viewed as a necessary step to their successful re-entry.

Their marginality is what Van Gennep (in Spradley & McCurdy, 1980) refers to as "transition." He proposed three phases in the "rites of passage": separation, transition, and incorporation. Kottak (1982) refers to them as separation, margin, and aggregation. The doctoral student, then, passes through three separate phases: (1) separation from the larger culture, e.g., leaving one's job, neighbors, and friends; (2) marginality or transition, in which he or she adopts the student role and carries out the activities necessary for preparation for re-entry into the larger society; and (3) aggregation, integration, or incorporation, in which the graduate becomes integrated or incorporated back into the larger society, such as by resuming employment, becoming active in the community, moving off campus, and establishing relationships with a new set of peers and colleagues.

Conclusions

Four major aspects of the married doctoral student's experiences may be used to describe behaviors, attitudes, perceptions, and relationships: (1) support, (2) marital stability, (3) social relationships, and (4) status.

Support: The most important source of support the student possesses is from the spouse, who provides financial, emotional/psychological, and basic needs support.

Financial support is derived from the non-student spouse's employment and the couple's modification of spending patterns, resulting in delayed gratification behaviors. Pursuit of doctoral study is seen as an investment in the couple's future, which necessitates extreme and sometimes burdensome commitment from the non-student spouse, often to the extent of abandoning friends and losing career mobility and professional growth while the student is enrolled. Enrollment may also require relocation of the family, with little consideration being given to the non-student wife's career prospects but full consideration for the non-student husband's career opportunities such that he is not penalized professionally and, in fact, actually advances his professional career as a result of the move.

There are differences in socioeconomic status by sex of the enrolled spouse, with the student wife couple having significantly greater financial resources than the student husband family.

Emotional/psychological support is provided in the form of encouragement, listening to the student's problems, sharing concerns and frustrations, and making important decisions independently so as to free the student from undue worry and anxiety. Sexual differences exist among students with regard to ability to reciprocate emotional/psychological support to the non-student

spouse. The non-student wife receives a lower level of support than the non-student husband, and this may lead to resentment and anger

Academic support is provided to facilitate completion of school-related demands. Similarity of spouses' professional interests and educational backgrounds and levels help to determine the quality of academic support.

Basic needs support includes performance of household tasks, child care, financial management, and other home and family related matters which make the home more conducive for study and relaxation. The student wife family is considerably more egalitarian than the student husband family in its sex-role orientation, which seems to be a factor in the wife's decision to matriculate. The student wife's participation in household tasks is also related to her need to continue to be perceived as an important and functioning member of the family.

Parents also provide financial, emotional/psychological, and basic needs support. Level of support often depends on parents' educational levels, sex of student, and whether or not the couple has children.

Marital Stability: The stability of the marriage can be threatened by the college environment, which is often perceived as being deleterious to marriage. The process of negotiating role demands and developing skills to cope with these demands may enhance the marital relationship. Factors which affect marital stability include differences in spouses' educational levels and interests, financial problems, time pressures, children, communication, sexual concerns, decision-making, role conflict, and physical and emotional separation. Heightened awareness of these factors may lead to greater coordination of time schedules, appreciation for each other's involvements, and the tendency to evade or neglect activities and associations which do not contribute to goal attainment. This tendency leads to what the student refers to as "myopia" or "tunnel vision", which may further isolate the

couple socially but bring the spouses closer to one another.

Social Relationships and Interaction: The university offers increased opportunities for the student to meet and interact with fellow students and faculty but does not necessarily foster the development of intimate relationships and friendships. Relationships which are developed do not serve an important support role beyond that of initially helping the student become acclimated to the university environment. Since most social needs are met within the family unit, there is little need for or likelihood to develop close associations with one's peers. Factors which influence the development of social relationships include changes in the student's interests and perceived status, extent of integration into university environment and local community, absence of peer group comprised of other married student, support role of spouse and family, special needs of the non-student spouse, changing expectations of friendships as the student matures, fears associated with terminating relationships upon graduation, use of professionals in resolving personal or marital problems, financial concerns, and children.

Status: Enrollment may alter the student's perceived or actual status in either a positive or negative way. Adopting the student role may be painful, especially if the student has been employed in a professional position, and can cause conflict as the student attempts to retain identity as a spouse, parent, employee, or some other role while also accepting the role of student. The extent to which becoming a student is perceived by friends as heightening or lowering status will also affect the nature and quality of these associations. Often enrollment disrupts these relationships drastically.

Status may be affected by one's need to reside away from the university community so as to preserve a former identity or one's present identity in

some role other than the student role. The need to prioritize student and family roles also affects status, with the student often having to alternate from one role to the other, depending on which has the most immediate or urgent demands.

Status comes to be measured in terms of one's enrollment in a doctoral program as opposed to enrollment in a lower level program of study. Grades help to enhance one's status as a student. If the student views the doctoral program as helping to enhance his or her skills and knowledge, then status as a student is much more acceptable than if the student views the student role as one in which the student simply responds to the varying demands of respective professors or fulfills responsibilities in a perfunctory manner. Locus of control is altered as a result of one's enrollment, since the student comes to feel that others, e.g., professors and advisers, make important decisions about his or her lifestyle, leaving few opportunities for one to make individual decisions. On the other hand, enrollment allows one to make important decisions about what classes to take, when one will schedule classes and other activities, and to make decisions about an important life role that is certain to enhance one's future.

Changes in financial condition may also affect status, but the student spouse views reduction in income as essential to the investment being made. Often, on the other hand, the couple experiences what it considers to be an actual increase in income after becoming enrolled. The potential loss of one's place in the family may also occur if the student's enrollment removes him or her from the home, minimizes the role formerly played, or leads to his or her replacement by the spouse in an important family role.

Finally, one's status is measured by the level and quality of assignments of the graduate/teaching associateships the student is given.

Implications for Higher Education

1. What is the institution's commitment to serving the needs of married students and their families?
2. What role should student orientation have in acquainting student couples with the experiences they are likely to face in their new roles as student and spouse, especially those which may be deleterious to the marriage?
3. To what extent are faculty, staff, and administrators knowledgeable about the unique experiences and concerns of married students?
4. What are the long-term effects of doctoral study on marriage and family relationships, and how can higher education help to minimize the negative impact of matriculation on family functioning?
5. To what extent are present services and resources designed to assist the married student both now and with re-entry into the larger society?
6. What criteria can be used to assess the nature and quality of student marriages and other nontraditional family forms, e.g., dual-career marriages, so that conventional assessment criteria are not used to determine married student problems and needs?
7. To what extent is the university responsible for helping the married student develop important support networks with fellow married students?
8. What is the institution's role in helping the larger community recognize and address the needs of married students?
9. What is the effect of the increasing number of older students, many of whom are married, on family functioning, and what are the effects of enrollment on these students' retention and performance?
10. Married students constitute approximately 25% of the student population, thus representing a tremendous human resource potential that may need help in optimizing the university experience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aller, Florence D. Some factors in marital adjustment and academic achievement of married students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 41, 609-616.

Bergen, Gerald R., and Bergen, Betsy. Quality of marriage of university students in relation to sources of financial support and demographic characteristics. The Family Coordinator, 1978, 27, 245-250.

Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

Brodsky, Annette. Women as graduate students. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 523-526.

Busselen, Harry J., and Busselen, Carroll K. Adjustment differences between married and single university students: an historical perspective. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24, 281-287.

Caplan, Gerald, and Killilea, Marie (Eds.). Support Systems and Mutual Help Multidisciplinary Exploration. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1976.

Chilman, C. S., and Meyer, D. I. Single and married undergraduates' measured personality needs and self-rated happiness. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1966, 28, 67-76.

Christensen, Harold T., and Philbrick, Robert E. Family size as a factor in the marital adjustment of college couples. American Sociological Review, 1952, 17, 306-312.

Christopherson, Victor A., Vandiver, Joseph S., and Krueger, Marie N. The married college student, 1959. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 122-128.

Chu, Lily, and Bergsma, Harold. Similarity in Locus of Control and Marital Satisfaction in College Students. Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mexico State University, Bureau of Educational Research, 1978.

Collins, A. H., and Pancoast, D. L. Natural Helping Networks. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1976.

DeLisle, F. H. Survey of undergraduate married women. Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1961, 25, 41-42.

DeLisle, F. H. The married woman undergraduate: report of an NAWDC ad hoc committee. Journal of National Association of Women Dean and College Counselors, 1965, 28 (3), 133-135.

Dressell, F. Logic, research and the married college student. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43, 920-924.

Eshleman, J. Ross, and Hunt, Chester L. Social class influences on family adjustment patterns of married college students. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1967, 29, 485-491.

Falk, Laurence L. A comparative study of problems of married and single students, Journal of Marriage and Family, 1964, 26, 207-208.

Feldman, Saul D. Impediment or stimulant? Marital status and graduate education. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78 (4), 982-994.

Flores, Thomas R. Student personnel programs for married students: a needs assessment. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 154-159.

Gilbert, Marvin G. The impact of graduate school on the family: a systems view. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1982, 23, 128-135.

Gottlieb, Benjamin H. Social support and social participation among residents of a married student housing complex. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1981, 22, 46-52.

Gottlieb, Benjamin H. The development and application of a classification scheme of informal helping behaviours. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1978, 10 (2), 105-115.

Gottlieb, B. H., and Todd, D. M. Characterizing and promoting social support in natural settings. In R. F. Munoz, L. R. Snowden, and J. G. Kelly (Eds.), Social and Psychological Research in Community Settings. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Graff, Robert W., and Horne, Arthur M. Counseling needs of married students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, 438-442.

Greenberg, Robert, and DeCoster, David A. Assessing the needs of married students and their families. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 1976, 13 (3), 24-34.

Gruver, Gene B., and Labadie, Susan K. Marital dissatisfaction among college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 454-458.

Hall, William M., and Valine, Warren J. The relationship between self-concept and marital adjustment for commuter college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1977, 18, 298-300.

Heller, K. The effects of social support: prevention and treatment implications. In A. P. Goldstein, and F. H. Kanter, (eds.), Maximizing Treatment Gains. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Hembrough, Betty L. A two-fold education challenge: the student wife and the mature woman student. Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1966, 29, 163-167.

Holmstrom, Engin I., and Holmstrom, Robert W. The plight of the woman doctoral student. American Educational Research Journal, 1974, 11 (1), 1-17.

Horne, Arthur M., and Wagner, Carol. The student personnel worker and the married student community: a proposal. Contemporary Education, 1974, 45 (4) 237-239.

Hurley, John R., and Palonen, Donna P. Marital satisfaction and child density among university student parents. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1967, 29, 483-484.

Khan, Janet A., and Sharpley, Chris T. Marital adjustment and value systems in student marriages. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1980, 21, 202-206.

Kottak, Phillip C. Cultural Anthropology. New York: Random House, 1982.

Large, Susan. An anxiety-support model for graduate education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1980, 21, 146-150.

Latange, Joseph E. College marriages. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1962, 3, 98-105.

Lee, Anne M. A study of married women college students. Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1960, 24 (3), 132-137.

Lofland, John. Doing Social Life: The Qualitative Study of Human Interaction in Natural Settings. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Marchand, Jean, and Langford, Louise. Adjustment of married students. Journal of Home Economics, 1952, 44, 113-114.

Marshall, William H., and King, Marcia P. Undergraduate student marriages: a compilation of research findings. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1966, 28, 350-358.

McCoy, Vivian Rogers. Student wives: lives in limbo. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1976, 25, 35-42.

McCoy, Vivian Rogers. Student wives: on the outside looking in. Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1979, 42, 10-16.

McKeon, David M., and Piercy, Fred P. Factors in marital adjustment of graduate students. Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1980, 43 (3), 40-43.

Medalia, N. Z. Marriage and adjustment: in college and out. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 40, 545-550.

Mueller, Kate H. The married student on the campus. College and University, 1960, 35, 155-163.

Oppelt, Norman T. Characteristics and activities of married college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1965, 6, 228-232.

Poloma, M. M., and Garland, T. The married professional woman: a study of the tolerance of domestication. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1971, 33, 531-540.

Rice, Joy K. Divorce and a return to school. Journal of Divorce, 1978, 1 (3), 247-257.

Riemer, Svend. Marriage on the campus of the University of Washington. American Sociological Review, 1942, 7, 802-815.

Schiavo, R. Steven. Finding Time for Companionship: Couples with Young Children. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations. New York, October 19-23, 1976.

Schlundt, Esther. The student wife. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1962, 26 (1), 44-46.

Selby, James E. Marital adjustment and marital communication of doctoral students and their wives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Missouri--Columbia, 1972.

Sharkan, W. W. Housing for married students. Journal of National Association of Deans and Women, 1954, 17, 84-87.

Skinner, Denise A. Dual-career family stress and coping: a literature review. Family Relations, 1980, 29, 473-480.

Spradley, James P. The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Spradley, James P., and McCurdy, David W. Anthropology: The Cultural Perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980.

Stephenson, Mary J. The Integration of School and Family Needs by Women Returning to College. Paper presented at the Lifelong Learning Research Conference, College Park, Maryland, February 1, 1980.

Sussman, Marvin B., and Burchinall, Lee. Kin family network: unheralded structure in current conceptualizations of family functioning. Marriage and Family Living, 1962, 24, 231-240.

Tolsdorf, C. C. Social networks, support, and coping: an exploratory study. Family Process, 1976, 15, 407-417.

Von der Embse, and Childs, Judith M. Adults in transition: a profile of the older college student. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1979, 20, 475-479.

Wegner, Eldon L. Some factors in obtaining postgraduate education. Sociology of Education, 1969, 42, 154-169.

Wilson, Kenneth M. Of Time and the Doctorate. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965.

Yamamoto, Kaoru. Married students and leisure: an exploration. College and University, 1965, 40 (2), 175-184.

Yess, James P. The influence of marriage on community college student achievement in specific programs of study. Research in Higher Education, 1981, 14 (2), 103-118.

APPENDIX A

Telephone Questionnaire

1. Age:_____

2. Sex: Male_____ Female_____

3. Race: _____White
   _____Black or Afro-American
   _____Mexican American or Chicano
   _____Puerto Rican
   _____Other Hispanic or Latin American origin
   _____Oriental/Asian American
   _____Native American, American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut
   _____Other (specify)

4. Number of years enrolled in Ph.D. program:_____

5. Number of years married:_____

6. Are you a local student? Yes_____ No_____

7. If you are not a local student, what is your permanent address? (city and state only)

   _____

8. Academic department in which you are enrolled:_____

   _____

9. Number of children: _____

10. Children's ages: _____

11. Is spouse enrolled in school? Yes_____ No_____

12. Is spouse enrolled at OSU? Yes_____ No_____

13. Is spouse enrolled full-time? Yes_____ No_____

14. Spouse's highest level of education attained:

    _____High school diploma
    _____Some college but no degree received
    _____Associate degree
    _____Bachelor's degree
    _____Master's degree
    _____Doctorate degree
    _____Professional degree (e.g., law, medicine)

15. Are you employed: Yes_____ No_____

If answer to 15 is "yes", complete 16 and 17; if "no", go to 18.

16. Are you employed full-time_____, or part-time_____?

17. What kind of position do you hold?_____

18. Is your spouse employed? Yes_____ No_____

19. Is your spouse employed full-time_____ or part-time_____?

20. What kind of position does your spouse hold?_____

21. Describe your living arrangements:

_____Self, spouse, and children (if any) live alone
_____Live with my parents
_____Live with spouse's parents
_____Live with other relatives
_____Live with friends
_____Other (specify)

22. Does your immediate family (parents) live in proximity to you?

Yes_____ No_____

23. Does your spouse's immediate family (parents) live in proximity to you?

Yes_____ No_____

24. When do you expect to graduate?_____
(quarter) (year)

APPENDIX B

Interview Guide I

1. Routine, daily activities: How are they carried out, who does what, when are they done, are sex roles altered, what happens when there is not enough time to complete duties, how is class and study time allocated?

2. Communication patterns: Do spouses talk to each other much, do they talk to others, when, how often, where?

3. Social participation: How do spouses spend leisure time/recreation time, with whom, where, how often; who do they visit, how often, why; do they attend campus events, why or why not?

4. Employment: Where is the student and his or her spouse employed; how many hours do they work; what are their feelings about employment?

5. Enrollment: What is the sex of the enrolled spouse; how does non-student spouse feel about not being in school; what advantages/disadvantages are there to one or both spouses' enrollment; how do school-related demands affect home life?

6. Children: How many are there; does enrollment influence childrearing practices; how old are children; what are the couple's perceptions of child's feelings about them as students; what child care arrangements have been made; does presence of children interfere with school work completion, with marital satisfaction?

7. Finances: Are they sufficient; what are sources of income; how are finances distributed; do income levels influence marital satisfaction; how does couple deal with need to delay gratification?

8. Relatives: Where do couple's families reside; are they nearby; do they assist with children, finances, etc.; are they supportive of student's enrollment?

9. Other: What are other unexplored areas of couples' lives that affect or are affected by enrollment?

APPENDIX B

Interview Guide II

1. Describe your average day.
2. How do you spend your free time?
3. With whom do you spend your leisure time?
4. What time pressures do you feel as a result of your role as student and/or spouse?
5. How do you go about meeting your financial obligations? Who makes these decisions?
6. How do you feel about your student role?
7. Describe your relationship with your children. How has your being in school affected your relationship with them, the amount and quality of time you spend with them, your childrearing practices and behaviors?
8. How does the student role affect your role as spouse?
9. Do you and your spouse talk much? about what? when? who initiates the conversation?
10. How have familial responsibilities been affected by your enrollment?
11. What major decisions must be made for the family? Who makes them? How?
12. Who do you talk to when you have problems and concerns with your children? With school? With your children's school? With parents, in-laws, spouse?
13. Do you and your spouse spend time together away from the children? How often, where, how long?
14. Do you participate in community life? How, how often?
15. When and where do you study. Why did you choose this place for study?
16. How much time do you spend weekly on studies? At work? With family? At leiusre?
17. How often do you visit your neighbors? How often do they visit you?
18. What activities do you engage in with neighbors?
19. When you want to have fun, "hang loose," etc., who do you call? Where do you go? What do you do?

20. Who are your closest friends, and where do they live?

21. How often are you in touch with your closest friends?

22. Do your closest friends have children?

23. Do you borrow from and/or share with your neighbors? What? How often?

24. How many of your neighbors do you know by name? How many know you by name?

25. What day-to-day activities do you participate in with neighbors, e.g., sharing babysitting, car pooling, shopping, attending worship services?

26. Who do you call most on the telephone? Why? How often? What do you talk about?

27. What is your primary life role right now, e.g., parent, spouse, employee, student? How is this determined?

28. Why do you live here?

29. Describe your typical day.

30. How often do you visit your parents? Your spouse's parents?

31. Do you often go out of town on weekends alone? with your spouse?

32. If you could live your life over, what would you prefer to be doing now?